DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 033 HE 014 787

AUTHOR	Brahney, James H.
TITLE	Higher Education Management: The Name of the Game Is Change.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Univ. Administrators, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	8p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of University Administrators, 1000 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20005 ($1.00).
JOURNAL CIT	Administrator's Update; v3 n1 Sum 1981
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Administrator Attitudes; *Change Strategies; Collective Bargaining; *College Administration; College Environment; College Planning; Decision Making; Declining Enrollment; Educational Change; Educational Objectives; Evaluation Criteria; Financial Problems; Governance; *Higher Education; *Leadership; *Needs Assessment; Outcomes of Education

ABSTRACT

Changes that higher education is experiencing and forecasting and approaches to improve higher education management are considered. In addition to declining enrollment, rising costs, and diminishing financial resources, colleges are faced with the task of managing these changes under the pressures of new constraints and new constituencies. Collective bargaining is affecting faculty participation on governance, and the influence of faculty is also being affected by its changing composition and distribution: the tenured professoriate is projected to continue to age. Additionally, students now serve on academic advisory bodies at most institutions, and most colleges have defined due process for students with regard to their rights. It is suggested that with trends toward centralization of authority and demands for increased accountability, governing boards have increased the scope of their activities and will become an increasingly important constraint on higher education's decision-making processes. Among the external constituencies are state government, accrediting agencies, local communities, benefactors, and business interests. Each has a vehicle for exerting influence on an institution. It is suggested that the inability to measure its effectiveness is important to higher education's adaptation to the changes it is experiencing, and that criteria for evaluation must be established. Decisions must be based on specificity of goals, comprehensiveness in developing plans to achieve those goals, and innovation in measuring outcomes. Executives need an aggressive and open-minded approach in searching for and testing new methods and need to recognize constraints that affect a decision. (SW)

ED211033

VOLUME 3

NUMBER 1

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

SUMMER 1981

HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT: THE NAME OF THE GAME IS CHANGE.

by James H. Brahney

American Association of
University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 287

Volume 3
Number 1

Administrator's Update

Summer
1981

American Association of University Administrators

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Higher Education Management: The Name Of The Game Is Change

By James H. Brahney

Everyone knows what management is. We all manage our personal finances and other domestic affairs, supervisors manage assembly-line workers, teachers manage the classroom, scientists manage the laboratory and their experiments. Some people manage the office, others the sales force . . . and we all manage to get by.

The term 'management' is used in almost every facet of human endeavor. Everyone uses the term, . . . but few could agree on a definition of what it actually is.

We hear and read about management theories, schools, processes, principles, styles, fundamentals, and elements. There are management functions and functional management, management systems and systems management, scientific management and management science. We have risk management and contingency management; there are financial managers, human resource managers, project managers, laissez faire managers, good managers, and bad managers.

The term "management" is used in almost every facet of human endeavor. Everyone uses the term, many practice the art (or science) of management, but few could agree on a definition of what it actually is. Simon (1960) and Leavitt (1978) concur in that the very essence of management is decision making. Drucker has said that "management is tasks. But management is also people" (1973, p. xiii). Most definitions of management allude to productivity, or profitability, or some other measure of "organizational success." Some theorists relate management to terms such as efficiency and effectiveness; some equate management to both terms and call it performance (Drucker 1973, p. 17).

The literature is full of well-worn phrases describing "organized anarchy" and "mismanagement" in higher education. One can easily find descriptions such as "they don't know how to govern themselves" or "their fiscal policy is to raise as much money as possible and spend it all." Based on evidence of past performance, "colleges and universities apparently do not know what their business is" (Stewart 1975, p. 17). Many would argue that "there is no such thing as academic management and that the subtitle is an impossibility" (Richman and Farmer 1977, p. 1).

Implied throughout the criticisms of higher education is that its executives have not given adequate attention to the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness. Drucker (1964) differentiates the two: efficiency is doing things right; effectiveness is doing the right things. The task of management is to ensure the proper balance between the two.

Higher education institutions must learn to do the *right things right.* As their executives begin to address the problem of maintaining a balance between efficiency and effectiveness, they become acutely aware of the impact of previous inattention to specificity of goals and outcome measurement. It is extremely difficult to measure efficiency when institutions' goals are "shrouded in vagueness" (Balderston 1978, p. 5). It is also difficult to assess effectiveness when outcomes are so "extraordinarily hard to isolate and measure" (Bowen 1978, p. 5). But it must be done. There has been a recent push for increased efficiency in higher education management (Ross 1976), and there have been cautions against a diminishing concern for effectiveness in light of that push. Executives must find and maintain the proper balance; they must learn to manage for performance. "This may be the biggest and most important management task in this century" (Drucker 1973, p. 166).

Superimposed on the structure of higher education is its commitment to meet the needs of the society it serves efficiently and effectively.

Superimposed on the structure of higher education is its commitment to meet the needs of the society it serves, efficiently and effectively. In order to accomplish its mission, higher education utilizes much of society's resources. Society demands that its institutions provide a reasonable return on its investment of resources. Higher education is not unlike profit-oriented institutions in terms of this social obligation. The college or university is no more exempt than other institutions to "justify its claims on society's resources" (Simon 1967, p. 68).

The future for higher education is most certainly one of change (Mayhew 1978). New and unfamiliar constraints are being imposed upon its operations. Various constituencies are exercising their influence on institutions more than ever before. Available resources are diminishing; enrollments are declining; and phrases such as program cutback, retrenchment, and financial exigency have entered the vernacular.

One of the most significant changes in higher education is the type of change itself.

James H. Brahney is Professor of Aerospace Studies at the University of Pittsburgh.

One of the most significant changes in higher education is the type of change itself. The great majority of institutions are planning for a future that reflects, as a maximum, maintaining the status quo. In most of the literature on organization and management, it is assured that the institution is expanding or at least interested in expanding (Cyert 1978). This is not the case in higher education. It is plannnig for an ominous future, one in which the major challenge will be to manage the change from rapid expansion to a state of equilibrium or possible contraction.

This paper highlights some of the changes that higher education is experiencing and forecasting. The changing environment is described, with emphasis on its many new constraints and constituencies. The problems of nonspecificity of goals and difficulty in measuring outcomes are related to attempts to maintain a balance between efficiency and effectiveness. The paper concludes by suggesting that the higher education executive's chances for success in meeting the formidable challenge of the future will be enhanced by a new open-mindedness, a new way of thinking about management and decision making.

The Changing Environment

During the quarter century following World War II, higher education witnessed enormous growth. The 1970s continued to reflect expansion, but it was accompanied by increasing complexity, strong emphasis on accountability, and demands for improved efficiency. The decade also saw new constraints such as student protests, unprecedented energy costs, faculty unionism, spiraling inflation. Yet, in 1979, American higher education became a $50 billion business, with a growth rate that exceeded the Consumer Price Index (Magarrell 1980).

The 1980s, however, were welcomed with a noticeable lack of enthusiasm in higher education. The outlook for the next twenty years is dominated by the threat of declining enrollment and continually rising costs. The Carnegie Council (1980) estimates a 40 percent enrollment decline between 1983 and 1989 and a 60 percent decline between 1991 and 1997. Diminishing financial resources require that change in higher education occur under conditions of limited growth or even retrenchment (Ashby 1974). The decade of the 1980s will "be one in which American colleges establish a basis for continuing development without the cushion of continuous growth" (Berquist and Shoemaker 1976, p. 1).

Institutions of higher education are faced with the task of managing the aforementioned changes under the pressures of new constraints and new constituencies. There are more claimants for power than ever before (Kerr 1970). The broad expanse of power and influence that numerous factions contended for during the 1970s resulted from higher education's inherently ambiguous nature. One of the main problems is that, traditionally, authority in higher education institutions has been diffused over several hierarchies. Only recently has there been a trend toward centralization of authority (Newman 1978, p. 123).

One reason for many new "interest groups vying for power and influence in higher education" (Richman and Farmer 1977, p. 4) was the void created by the isolation of its institutions from the rest of society in terms of accountability. "Higher education was often viewed as a unique enterprise which could regulate itself through reliance on traditions and consensual agreement" (Kaplin 1979, p. 4). During the growth period, "it was not necessary to make choices . . . constraints rarely played a critical role [in the decision making process]" (Arns and Poland 1980, p. 268). In situations of financial strife, however, decision making authority usually seeks the highest levels of an organization.

A concomitant problem is that of maintaining an equitable balance between accountability and the degree of authority delegation. It is not an uncommon problem, but it is a particular challenge to higher education executives (Sprunger and Berquist 1978, p. 61). Certain constraints have caused a centralization of authority and, consequently, a "crisis of authority." Bonham (1978) attributes the severity of the crisis not to uniqueness or complexity, but to the fact that higher education institutions rarely have access to the amount of resources that other institutions do.

At various times in the annals of higher education, both internal and external constituencies have made attempts to influence institutional policy and decision making. These attempts are cyclical in nature: one group appears to gain some influence, but then the pendulum swings another way. Early institutions were dominated by their presidents and governing boards (Veysey 1965). By the start of this half century, the "administration" as we know it today had evolved. An aura of collegiality pervaded higher education in the 1960s as faculty became an integral part of governance in this unique social institution.

Several attempts were made to describe higher education decision making via models of governance. Corson (1960) identified both a faculty and administrative hierarchy in the dual-organization model. Millett (1968) described the collegial model, heavy in faculty participation. Bennis (1971) characterized the bureaucratic model and Baldridge (1971) the political model. None of the models is flawless and none is universal. They were all devised prior to higher education's current set of circumstances. They were not portrayed in an environment of change, nor were they subjected to the constraints that act upon today's institutions.

In spite of the collegial atmosphere of the 1960s, it appears that the faculty-administration interaction has always been based on an adversary relationship.

In spite of the collegial atmosphere of the 1960s, it appears that the faculty-administration interaction has always been based on an adversary relationship. Faculty developed "a kind of academic condescension toward administrators . . . [who in turn] view them as servants rather than [as] leaders of the professoriate" (Duryea 1971, p. 348). Several factors have guided the extent to which faculty has influenced the decision making process.

An interesting ambivalence in faculty attitude was revealed in a study during the late 1960s. Faculty members indicated a strong desire for participation in decision making but were hesitant to devote the necessary time to perform adequately in that role (Dykes 1968, p. 41). It has also been discovered recently that fewer faculty members have been making the transition into administrative positions than before (Millett 1977). With trends toward centralization of authority, therefore, there are fewer former faculty members in positions of decision making authority.

Those institutions will now have to live with the many internally developed administrative rules and procedures that govern the rights of their faculty and students. A future of contractive change may make that an awesome challenge.

Collective bargaining is affecting faculty participation in governance; about one of every five institutions now has such agreements. The full impact of faculty unionism has not been realized as yet, but it is sure to change the faculty role in governance (Gabarino 1974, p. 4). The influence of faculty is also being affected by its changing composition and distribution. The tenured professoriate is projected to continue to age, with the modal group rising from 36-45 years in 1980 to 56-65 years in

Several of the major issues that face executives in higher education in this era of change are interrelated. In coping with the changing environmental pressures acting on their operations, managers will weigh emphasis on efficiency against considerations of effectiveness. To be able to do this properly, it is first necessary to develop suitable measurements of efficiency and effectiveness. This, then, leads to a viable decision making process, one that will permit higher education executives to better plan for a future of continued change and one, if hopes are realized, of continued success.

Efficiency is commonly measured by comparing resources used to benefits achieved. The underlying concept is that resources can be equated to dollars and that benefits should at least be commensurate with cost. "It is often argued that a concept so crass as efficiency is quite out of place in endeavors so lofty as education" (Change Panel 1976, p. 27). But higher education is in the midst of an era of accountability, a period in which calls for efficiency are loud and clear from all sectors. "The demand for efficiency and accountability is legitimate" (Bowen 1978, p. 21). Institutional leaders are going about the business of increasing efficiency.

A wide array of tools is being used in higher education to improve its efficiency. Prior to the 1970s, a widespread opinion in higher education was that corporate management techniques were not at all transferable to higher education. There has been, however, a considerable degree of acceptance and testing of many applicable business management methods in the past decade. These include management information systems (MIS), innovative planning and budgeting systems, computer-based simulation models, and the application of quantitative techniques of decision making.

Many institutions tested and now use the Department of Defense Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (Knezevich 1973). Several cost-projection models have been devised specifically for higher education. They are identified by a veritable alphabet soup: RRPM, SEARCH, HELP/PLANTRAN, CAMPUS, and others (see Plourde 1976, for critiques). There has also been a movement in many institutions to build data bases and MIS for aiding decision makers. Management by objectives (MBO) has been employed in numerous institutions, and "generally speaking, [it has been] relatively successful" (Schroeder 1977, p. 101). There are many other indications that higher education is searching for new ways to improve its efficiency. Quantitative techniques are being applied in over half the colleges and universities in the United States (Heim 1975). Institutions have also expanded their views of the total environment in which they function; their planning processes are systemic and comprehensive (Freeman 1977).

Many critics of higher education claim that the structure and process of governance seem more important than its outcomes (Cohen and March 1974). Participation has become an end in itself, rather than a means to an end. In its recent attempts to address the dramatically changing environment, higher education has turned its attention to outcomes. Outcomes are the results of the efforts of an institution; they determine measures of an organization's effectiveness.

It has become apparent that the inability to measure its effectiveness has had significant impact on higher education's adaptation to the changes it is experiencing.

It has become apparent that the inability to measure its effectiveness has had significant impact on higher education's adaptation to the changes it is experiencing. The enigma is that the outcomes of higher education are extremely difficult to measure (Bowen 1978, p. 22). Some analysts regard this as an alibi rather than an explanation (Drucker 1973, p. 137). The premise is that an institution must define its specific purpose and then gear all decisions to fulfilling that purpose. What underlies the concept of effectiveness is "a clear commitment to one specific definition of purpose and mission" (Drucker 1973, p. 152).

In order for managers to be able to assess their institutions' efficiency and effectiveness, they must establish specific goals. Those goals must support accomplishment of the institution's specific mission or purpose. A major use of goals is as criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness (Miles 1980). Unfortunately, in higher education goals have traditionally been expressed in vague terms (Peterson and Vale 1973). Only recently have institutions begun to state clearly what it is they are trying to accomplish (Lawrence and Service 1977, p. 48).

As an integral part of the overall goal setting and outcome measurement process, criteria for evaluation must be established. "It is necessary to identify suitable measures or indicators of those goals and objectives that can be used in a rational and systematic manner to judge the accomplishment of mission, goals, and objectives" (Fincher 1978, p. 3). To achieve measures of effectiveness, specific goals must be established, criteria and standards of performance must be set, and continuous evaluation of progress toward achieving those goals must be made.

Several workable methods have been devised recently to help executives in higher education establish specific goals (Gross and Grambsch 1974; Peterson and Uhl 1975; and Bowen 1978). Other instruments have been developed to assist in outcome measurement (Peterson and Vale 1973; Micek 1974; and Romney 1976). Several catalogues and lists of goals and tools for measuring outcomes are available for executives who wish to explore all the available means at their disposal (see aforementioned references). A comprehensive understanding of modern management tools can assist higher education executives confront the changing environment. Managers in higher education must know their constraints and constituencies and must be capable of managing the organization's power relationships with them (Galbraith 1977). Higher education leaders must draw on *all* the available concepts and ideologies: "The emphasis is on the practical application of management concepts, and the effort is ultimately judged by the results it achieves for the institution" (Park 1980, p. 74). Executives should not be inhibited by the restrictive values of a mismanaged past.

A descriptive model of what Simon (1960) termed "administrative man" was developed with the premise that, because managers do not know all the possible alternatives available, they frequently reduce the complexity of a problem to whatever level is required to make the decision. Simon coined the term "satisfice," a combination of satisfy and suffice. He claims that a manager tends to satisfice rather than to pursue the best possible solution. A comprehensive review of the literature leads one to conclude that higher education has been satisficing for too long.

As an integral part of the overall goal setting and outcome measurement process, criteria for evaluation must be established.

An appropriate balance between efficiency and effectiveness in institutions of higher education can be achieved only through a comprehensive approach to decision making and planning. Decisions must be based on specificity of goals, comprehensiveness in developing plans to achieve those goals, innovation in measuring outcomes, and on a moral commitment to meet society's needs and to utilize its resources efficiently. The process focuses on a new way of managerial thinking—new

2000. With or without collective bargaining, executives will have to operate with much less flexibility than is afforded by a younger group, which is less entrenched in the traditions of higher education, and is inherently less resistant to change.

Although student pressure for participation in governance has waned in the past several years, their involvement in the late 1960s did precipitate some changes. Students now serve on academic advisory bodies at most institutions. In addition, most colleges and universities have defined due process for students with regard to their rights as members of the institutions (Balderston 1978, p. 252). The courts decided on most due process questions with regard to faculty employment rights in the 1970s; this was an expensive proposition for colleges and universities. Similar questions were raised about student rights, but most institutions took "preventive maintenance" steps rather than being forced to spend inordinate amounts of money in continuous litigation. Those institutions will now have to live with the many internally developed administrative rules and procedures that govern the rights of their faculty and students. A future of contractive change may make that an awesome challenge.

In addition to faculty, administration, boards, and students, the higher education environment is being influenced more and more by a widening group of external constituencies.

In addition to projections of enrollment decline, the composition of the student body also is changing. In 1960, enrollment was primarily composed of full-time, young white males. By the year 2000, it is envisioned that there will be more female than male students, as many over twenty-one years old as under, nearly as many part-time as full-time, and about one-quarter of all students will be minorities (Carnegie Council 1980). Executives in higher education will be faced with dealing with different kinds of attitudes, needs, and values as the student body completes this transition. A broader scope of sociological parameters will be entering the decision making process, and there will be shifts in emphasis to new and unfamiliar considerations.

Since the early 1970s, boards of trustees have come under increasing criticism from within as well as outside the institutions they serve. Governing boards have been criticized for their lack of concern, assertiveness, and managerial accountability (Budd 1974). With current trends toward centralization of authority and demands for increased accountability, boards have become more involved in a broader scope of institutional activities. Many see that pattern evolving into a joint partnership between the trustees and the central administration (Riley 1976). The influence (and authority) of governing boards will become an increasingly important constraint on higher education's decision making processes.

In addition to faculty, administration, boards, and students, the higher education environment is being influenced more and more by a widening group of *external* constituencies. Just a few are professional societies, accrediting agencies, local communities, alumni groups, benefactors, and business interests. Each has a vehicle for exerting influence on an institution; each is being heard more now than ever. As part of the large society that higher education serves, they are demanding that institutions be operated efficiently, fairly, and effectively (Jencks and Riesman 1977).

"State government is still the chief source of funding for higher education" (Glenny 1977, p. 183). Via planning and coordinating boards and, of course, by virtue of their budgets, states are exercising more controls over their institutions than ever before. Higher education journals are replete with reports about the austerity of state budgets. Some cutbacks have ultimately resulted in cancellation of programs. States are taking a much greater interest in the efficiency and effectiveness with which their institutions are being managed. "They want the use of precious resources to be planned wisely, carried out efficiently, and accounted for honestly" (Huitt 1978, p. 80). State governments represent a constituency to be reckoned with in managing the changing higher education environment.

Gladieux and Wolanin (1978, p. 199) assert that "there exists no conscious, coherent national policy [on higher education]." Yet, the federal government has been involved at least indirectly in the support of higher education since the 1862 Morrill Act. The influence of the federal government has increased dramatically in the past three decades. From 1951 to 1976, federal expenditures for higher education rose from .15 percent of the Gross National Product (GNP) to .62 percent of the GNP (Rigolot 1980). American colleges and universities and their students received approximately $12 billion in fiscal year 1976 from the federal government (Breneman and Finn 1978, p. 32). This substantial financial support has brought about increased compliance requirements because of the expectation that higher education should be accountable for the use of the funding it receives. Institutional leaders will regard the continued demand for accountability as one of the prime environmental constraints on their decision making capability.

These changes in the environment, including its new constraints and new constituencies, provide the setting for higher education's attempts to manage change. The way in which institutions systematically plan for the long-range and changing future will dictate their success or failure. What is needed is a comprehensive view of the total environment in which institutions exist. Many institutional planning efforts fail over the long run because they consist of a strategy of "disjointed incrementalism"—shortsighted piecemeal responses to complex social problems (Michael 1973). "There seems to be growing recognition, even within academic institutions, not only that they are seriously mismanaged, but also that something should and must be done about it" (Richman and Farmer 1977, p. 13). The problem becomes more challenging when managers consider the kind of changing environment in which attempts will be made to correct this mismanagement. "In the United States we have demonstrated our capacity to plan and to act for growth. We have yet to demonstrate our capacity to plan and to act for stabilized operation, let alone for decline" (Millett 1977, p. 94).

The way in which institutions systematically plan for the long-range and changing future will dictate their success or failure. What is needed is a comprehensive view of the total environment in which institutions exist.

Coping With Change: A New Way of Thinking

It is said that "colleges and universities are always changing," and that change is "a topic constantly being discussed in higher education circles" (Baldridge and Deal 1977, p. 80). Yet, in a review of the literature before the 1970s, it is difficult to locate discussions of change and impossible to discover anything pertaining to contraction. The reason is obvious: higher education was riding the crest of enormous growth and expansion. Not until the mid-1970s did higher education begin to come to grips with the changes alluded to earlier. There have been numerous forces acting upon higher education, some have dictated growth and others have caused decline. "Only if these issues are addressed openly and realistically can the effectiveness and vitality of colleges and universities be maintained" (Dresch 1977, p. 20).

to higher education. It requires an aggressive and open-minded approach on the part of its executives. It will not be sufficient to merely accept new methods; executives will have to search them out and test them. Paramount in the decision making process must be consideration of the many constraints that act upon a given decision. Equally important will be the consideration of the many factions who expect to play a role in the process. The degree of involvement of those constituencies will be determined by those in authority. It will take a delicate and sometimes intuitive touch to know who, when, and how much when executives turn to delegate authority in an era of contractive change.

Maccoby suggests that the successful leaders will be those who "can stand back and let others share the functions of leadership but be able to assert authority on issues of principle, articulating those principles in terms of essential values" (1979 p. 22). There are ways of managing the institution efficiently and effectively without destroying academic freedom or autonomy or its other revered values and purposes. An inquiring and receptive attitude toward "new ways of coping" will be needed to manage the change from rapid expansion to tenuous equilibrium or gradual contraction, while avoiding stagnation or catastrophic failure.

REFERENCES

Arns, Robert G., and Poland, William. "Changing the University Through Review." *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (1980): 267-284.

Ashby, Eric. *Adapting Universities to a Technological Society.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Balderston, Frederick E. *Managing Today's University.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Baldridge, J. Victor. *Academic Governance.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor; Curtis, David V.; Ecker, George; and Riley, Gary. "Diversity in Higher Education: Professional Autonomy." *Journal of Higher Education* 48 (1977): 367-388.

Baldridge, J. Victor, and Deal, Terrance E. "Change Processes in Educational Organizations." In *Governing Academic Organizations,* edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Bennis, Warren G. "The Coming Death of Bureaucracy." In *Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability,* edited by L. H. Browder. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971.

Berquist, William H., and Shoemaker, William A. "Facilitating Comprehensive Institutional Development." *New Directions for Higher Education* 15 (1976): 1-50.

Bonham, George W. "Who Runs the Show?" In *The Third Century.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Bowen, Howard R. *Investment in Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Breneman, David W., and Finn, Chester E., eds. *Public Policy and Private Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Budd, John F. "Are College Trustees Obsolete?" *Saturday Review,* 9 March, 1974.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Three Thousand Futures, The Next Twenty Years for Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Change Panel on Academic Economics. *Colleges and Money.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1976.

Cohen, Michael D., and March, James G. *Leadership and Ambiguity.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Corson, John J. *The Governance of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Cyert, Richard M. "The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size." *Public Administration Review,* July/August 1978, pp. 344-349.

Dresch, Stephen P. "Dynamics of Growth and Decline." *New Directions for Higher Education* 19 (1977): 17-32.

Drucker, Peter F. *Managing for Results.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Management, Tasks, and Responsibilities. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Duryea, Edwin D. "Reform in University Government." *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (May 1971): 339-352.

Dykes, Archie R. *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision-Making.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Fincher, Cameron. "Importance of Criteria for Institutional Goals." *New Directions for Institutional Research* 19 (1978): 1-16.

Freeman, Jack E. "Comprehensive Planning in Higher Education." *New Directions for Higher Education* 5 (1977): 33-52.

Gabarino, J. W. *Statement, Hearings on Collective Negotiation in Higher Education.* California Legislature, Joint Committee on Post-Secondary Education, 19 April 1974.

Galbraith, Jay R. *Organizational Design.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Gladieux, Lawrence E., and Wolanin, Thomas R. "Federal Politics." In *Public Policy and Private Higher Education,* edited by David W. Breneman and Chester E. Finn, Jr. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978.

Glenny, Lyman A. "Coordination and Planning Despite Competition and Confusion." In *Governing Academic Organizations,* edited by Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. *Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Heim, Peggy. *Impact of NCHEMS Upon Its Active Constituency.* Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1975.

Huitt, Ralph K. "Autonomy on the Line." In *The Third Century.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Kaplin, William A. *The Law of Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Kerr, Clark. "Governance and Functions." *Daedalus* 99 (1970): 108-121.

Knezevich, Stephen J. *Program Budgeting.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1973.

Lawrence, G. Ben, and Service, Allan L. *Quantitative Approaches to Higher Education Management: Potential, Limits, and Challenge.* ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 144 439, MF-$1.09; PC-$10.35.

Leavitt, Harold J. *Managerial Psychology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Maccoby, Michael. "Leadership Needs of the 1980s." *Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979. ED 193 997. MF-$1.09; PC not available EDRS.*

Magarrell, Jack. "U.S. Colleges' Spending Up 9.5 pct. in 1979, Hits $50-Billion a Year." Chronicle of Higher Education 25 August 1980: p. 11.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "Lessening Influence and the Search for Purpose." In *The Third Century.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Micek, Sidney S. *The Higher Education Outcome Measures Identification Study.* Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management System, 1974. ED 102 911. MF-$1.09; PC-$14.01.

Michael, Donald N. *On Planning to Learn—And Learning to Plan.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Miles, Robert H. *Macro Organizational Behavior.* Santa Monica: Goodyear, 1980.

Millett, John D. *Decision-Making and Administration in Higher Education.* Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968.

"Managing Change in Higher Education." *New Directions for Higher Education* 19 (1977): 1-15, 91-96.

Newman, Frank. "Taking the Helm." In *The Third Century.* New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1978.

Park, Dabney, Jr. "What Management Is and Isn't." *Educational Record* 61 (1980): 72-75.

Peterson, Richard E., and Uhl, Norman P. *Institutional Goals Inventory: Comparative Data and Bibliography.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1975.

Peterson, Richard E., and Vale, C. A. *Strategies for Assessing Institutional Effectiveness in Multi-Campus Systems.* Berkeley: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Plourde, Paul. "Institutional Use of Models: Hope or Confused Frustration." *New Directions in Institutional Research* 9 (1976): 17-34.

Richman, Barry M., and Farmer, Richard N. *Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rigolot, Carol. *Fiscal Issues in Higher Education.* American Council of Life Insurance, 1980.

Riley, Gary L. "Collective Bargaining and Collective Management: Two New Partners in Community College Governance." In *Preparing Trustees With Better Tools of Boardmanship."* Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1976.

Romney, Leonard C. "Institutional Goal Achievement: Measures of Progress." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1976.

Ross, Murray G. *The Anatomy of Academe.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Schroeder, Roger G. "Management Systems Design: A Critical Appraisal." *New Directions for Institutional Research* 13 (1977): 99-113.

Simon, Herbert A. *The New Science of Management Decisions.* New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

"The Job of a College President." *Educational Record* 48,1 (Winter 1967): 68-69.

"Forward." In Gary Dessler, *Organization and Management: A Contingency Approach.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Sprunger, Benjamin E., and Berquist, William. *Handbook for College Administration.* Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1978.

Stewart, Clifford T. "The Role of the University." *New Directions for Higher Education* 12 (1975): 17-22.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American University.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Bibliography

To order documents in the bibliography identified by an ED number, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), Computer Microfilm International Corporation, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Documents with HE numbers are presently being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Research in Education (RIE). In ordering, ED numbers must be specified. MF indicates microfiche and PC denotes printed copy; payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00; and all orders must be in writing.

Administrator's Update is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University. Washington, D.C. Series Editor is Glenn M. Nelson, Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education *Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of University Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the AAUA or the National Institute of Education.*

Copies of Administrator's Update may be ordered for $1.00 each from the American Association of University Administrators, 1000 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

American Association of University Administrators
1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage Paid
Washington, DC.
20005
Permit No. 3235